

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12 and 14-34 remain in this application. Claims 1-34 are rejected. Claims 2, 5 and 13 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-12, 15, 18-23, 25-28 and 30-33 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicants herein traverse and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 4-19, 21 and 25-34 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended to remove or correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-19, 21 and 25-34 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

Claims 1-34 are rejected as obvious over Ng (US 5,971,855) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicants herein respectfully traverse this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be properly established in the rejection of independent claims 1, 4 and 7. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)." MPEP §706.02(j) "Contents of a 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection".

Claims 1, 4 and 7 are amended to incorporate subject matter formerly presented in claims 2, 5 and 13, respectively, and which have been canceled. Therefore, the amendments to each of the independent claims are not believed to raise new issues as the subject matter of the canceled dependent claims was previously presented for consideration.

In accordance with the subject matter of the independent claims in their present form, when a character for which initial training values has been set is judged as having been trained successfully, character data is transferred from a game terminal to an external side thereof (i.e., a second game terminal). The character data

corresponds with the training initial values for the character and the given items such that a user on the second game terminal can begin training (i.e. retraining) the character having the training initial values and the given items acquired during the preceding training process.

It is respectfully submitted that the Ng reference is silent regarding such feature by which training initial values set before training of a character, along with items given to the character in the course of training, are transferred from one game terminal to an other game terminal after training has been judged successful, such that the character received by the other game terminal can be retrained by an other game player operating the other game terminal using the training initial values which were set before the preceding training and the given items received during such preceding training at a start of the retraining (i.e., subsequent training) by the other game player.

It is admitted by the Examiner that Ng fails to disclose transmitting initial training values along with data of a successfully trained character. However, it is the Examiner's opinion that Ng teaches the posting of various statistics of a user's virtual character, citing the disclosure at col. 2, lines 47-49 and col. 9, line 1- col. 10, line 67, which include initial training values, and therefore it would have been obvious to directly transmit such data directly, rather than over a website. Applicants have reviewed the noted passages in Ng, and can find nothing whatsoever in these portions of the disclosure, or for that matter in the entirety of the disclosure,

that would suggest utilizing the same training initial values of a game player set in a first game terminal by a subsequent, and presumably different, game player on a second game terminal, along with given items received during training, after it is judged that the training is successful. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to transmit, directly or otherwise, data representing the training initial values set by a first player as set before training thereby to another game terminal for use of these same values as a starting point for retraining by a subsequent game player, after successful training by the first. It should be noted that this claimed feature is quite different than posting completed scores and statistics, since these latter data represent the final achievements of the game player posting such data. In stark contrast, the claimed invention provides a second game player with the training values set initially before training is performed by a first game player, so that the second game player can start the retraining with the same values used by the first player who has already successfully trained the character.

Thus, the prior art reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, and moreover provides no motivation to vary the disclosure in any manner which would arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the claims are not made obvious by the Ng reference. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-34 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request a two (2) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$420 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Jimmy J. Hill
Reg No. 36,049